REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application. New claims 10-13 are added by this Amendment. Applicant thanks Examiner for acknowledging Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate acceptance of the drawings in the next Office Action. Additionally, Applicant requests that the Examiner consider the references cited in Applicant's November 18, 2003 Information Disclosure Statement in the next Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 1-9

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by either Gorog, (U.S. Patent No. 4,947,028), Roach et al. (hereinafter, Roach) (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,394), or Hartman et al. (hereinafter, Hartman) (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,411). Applicant notes that the Examiner did not specifically address which portions of Gorog, Roach, or Hartman disclose or suggest the features of the present invention. 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 provides that "[w]hen a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable." While each of aforementioned patents disclose automated ordering systems in general, Applicant respectfully submits that their disclosure does not teach or suggest the features recited in the claims. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to allow the claims in view of the claim amendments provided herein, or issue a Non-Final Office Action further designating the particular parts of the patents relied upon in the rejection.

Applicant notes the Examiner's statement that the claims do not appear to recite the "simultaneous" transmission of the order to both the order reception system and the shop order system. In addition to this "simultaneous" transmission of the order, the present invention also discloses an embodiment in which, as recited in amended claims 1 and 4 includes a first registration element (registering step in an order reception system), a transmission element (transmitting step) and a second registration element (registering step in a shop ordering system) which *registers* order identification information and order information *substantially simultaneously* with the registration in the order reception system. With such a feature, the present invention makes it possible to register orders in a plurality of systems substantially simultaneously by one operation, because an order registration in one ordering system activates a registration in another ordering system (see page 2, lines 9-12 and page 9, lines 21-23 of the present application) . Thus, Applicant submits that the "simultaneous" features of the present invention are neither disclosed nor suggested in either Gorog, Roach, or Hartman.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 4, and 7 to include the aforementioned simultaneous registration feature soley to advance prosecution of the particular embodiment recited in these claims. As such, Applicant reserves the right to prosecute other embodiments of the invention, including the "simultaneous" transmission feature that the Examiner cites, in a continuing application.

Further, a feature of the present invention as defined by claim 7, and new claims 12 and 13 relates to a registration element (registering) in each system, and a first transmission element and a second transmission element (transmitting information to a salesclerk terminal) which

transmit information based on registration results in an order reception system and a shop ordering system to a salesclerk terminal. With such a feature, the present invention as defined by Claims 7, 12 and 13 makes it possible to register orders in a plurality of systems by one operation and to confirm the registration results in each system together (see page 9, lines 18-20)

Differences Between the Present Invention and Each of the Cited References

The cited reference Gorog discloses an automated order and payment system. In Gorog, an Order Computer Terminal (OCT) communications module in a central computer system (CCS) divides order packet data issued by a consumer into order data and credit data (see column 6, lines 17-36). Then, the CSS verifies that products or services are available based on the order data and verifies the credit worthiness of the consumer based on the credit data (see the Gorog Abstract) .

However, Gorog merely discloses verifying the availability of products or services and the credit worthiness of a purchaser based on the "separated" data, and does not disclose or suggest registering information in a plurality of systems. In fact, Gorog is completely silent as to the features of the present invention as recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 12 and 13.

The cited reference Roach discloses a system for processing merchandise sale transactions wherein two systems operate in support of each other. In Roach, however, a sales transaction record is stored on a POS controller 12 (a sale system, see column 9, lines 9-12), and is subsequently sent to a warehouse system when a customer selects "Total function" (see column 12, line 61 - column 13, line 1).

In this way, Roach requires a determination step of a customer for registering the sale transaction record stored on the POS controller 12 to the warehouse system, and is completely silent as to the feature of registering the information in a plurality of systems substantially simultaneously by one operation as recited in claims 1 and 4. Moreover, Roach is also completely silent as to the feature of a second transmission element (transmitting information to a salesclerk terminal) as recited in claims 7 , 12, and 13.

The cited reference Hartman discloses a method and system to purchase an item by a single action. In Hartman, a server system assigns and sends a client identifier, which is associated with purchaser-specific order information, to a client system once when the client system first interacts with the server system. From then on, the client system adds its client identifier to all messages sent to the server system so that the server system can identify the source of the message (see column 6, lines 7-21). Since the server system can identify purchase-specific order information stored at the server system with the client identifier, there is no need for sensitive information (e.g., a name of a customer) to be transmitted via the Internet. In this way, Hartman discloses a single-action ordering system, and neither discloses nor suggests registering information in a plurality of systems. As such, Hartman does not teach the features of the present invention recited in claims 1, 4, 7, 12 and 13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims are allowable for at least these reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.